

Some amendments have been offered that address aspects of the Iraq war. These amendments only serve to advance the current failed policy. Instead of giving us the new direction and the fresh thinking that we so badly need, this policy, these amendments continue what already exists.

I oppose, for example, one amendment mandating that we must turn over Iraq's security to the Iraqis only when they are ready for that responsibility and that we must not, and I quote, withdraw prematurely the U.S. Armed Forces from Iraq, unquote. Prematurely.

Mr. Speaker, do more than 2,000 Americans have to die, or 2,000 more Americans have to die before we recognize that bringing our troops home is not premature, but a fact that is long overdue?

This amendment also states that troop withdrawal cannot happen until we are close to realizing a free and stable Iraq that is at peace and not a threat to its neighbors. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that such a policy would make this an endless war because the amendment has it exactly backwards. There can be no stability in Iraq while our troops are still there. It is our very military presence and the resentment that it is breeding that is emboldening the insurgency. It is only by ending the occupation that we can hope to quell the violence and give the Iraqi people some hope for peace and security.

As I said, I will vote for H.R. 2601 because I believe there is plenty that is good and important in this bill. The architects of the legislation should be commended for authorizing billions in foreign aid that will go a long way toward improving lives around the globe.

But once again, and I repeat, this bill represents a missed opportunity to completely reexamine Iraq and foreign policy more generally. With this bill we could have charted a new course, launched a new and more peaceful strategy for helping Iraq stand on its own two feet. But all we have done on Iraq is declared it U.S. policy to extend our military presence indefinitely.

In Iraq, and around the world, I believe we need to adopt what I call a SMART security plan. SMART stands for sensible multilateral American response to terrorism. It would make military action not a reflex, but a very last resort. SMART would fight terrorism with brains, not brawn, with stronger multilateral alliances, improved intelligence capabilities and vigorous weapons inspections. It would forbid the sale and transfer of weapons to regions of conflict. The agreement reached yesterday with India most certainly would not meet the standards of SMART.

SMART also calls on the United States to set an example for the world by living up to its own nuclear non-proliferation commitments, something H.R. 2601 clearly does not mandate. SMART would divert resources from Cold War weapons systems, reinvesting

them in Homeland Security and energy independence. And SMART would attack terrorism at its roots with an ambitious international development plan for the troubled regions around the world.

Democracy building support, human rights education, education programs, small business development, these are the cures to the poverty, oppression and hopelessness that breed terrorism in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my support for H.R. 2601. But I lament its failure to substantially or realistically address the most pressing foreign policy challenge in our generation, the supremely misguided war in Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LEAKS FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, a lot has been made lately about leaks coming from the White House, and the outing of CIA Agent Valerie Wilson was admittedly an egregious act.

But I, for one, would like more leaks, not less from this White House. And let me quote the President. Bring it on.

Let me be clear. I am not looking for more of the kind of leaks that have tripped up Karl Rove and Scooter Libby. It is generally not a good idea to out undercover CIA agents working on behalf of America's national security. Those are the types of leaks that can lead to unfortunate consequences, like people getting killed and national security being breached.

Even if you leak on double super secret background you might get caught. And if there is a special prosecutor involved, well, look out. You could end up, as the old cliché in the book says, the former White House official is doing time in Allenwood.

The kind of leaks I am thinking about might include like the real cost of the prescription drug bill for Medicare or the secret plan for Social Security solvency. Those are the types of

leaks that I wish this White House would provide and knew. It would have been useful, for example, if someone had leaked the true cost of the Medicare prescription drug program before Congress had voted to commit future generations to twice the obligation we were told.

Originally they told us that the prescription drug bill would cost \$394 billion over 10 years. The American people are going to pay \$800 billion. The administration actually kept secret the extra \$400 billion from the Congress and the American people. And they even threatened to fire the government actuary who wanted to just simply tell the truth. All along they knew that it was going to be \$800 billion and all along they repeated that it was \$394 billion.

Now that was the type of leak that is worthy of a good Washington leak. And I think I know something about leaks.

And it certainly would have been nice if some brave soul in the White House had told the American people that the President's tax cuts would raid the Social Security Trust Fund for \$639 billion, explode the deficit, all the while benefiting the wealthiest Americans. Instead they told us we could have a big tax cut, balance the budget and strengthen Social Security. Of course, former Secretary of Treasury Paul O'Neill eventually blew the whistle on what the real cost of the tax cut was. But by that time it was too late for him and too late for the American people, and Social Security is \$639 billion less today in the trust fund, all because nobody wanted to tell the truth when they knew it.

But these are not the only examples of not willing to tell the truth to the American people, and wanting to hold back information when they should have done what their instincts were, which was to leak. Remember when we had the terrorist report from the State Department and somebody actually had to doctor the data to say that in fact there was a decline in terrorism when all along they knew there was an increase in terrorism. And Secretary Powell had to come back with a new report, a fresh report to show what the actual data said originally, which was there was a rise in terrorism in the last number of years.

Then there was the mercury report from the EPA which was doctored and played with, and they tried to doctor up; as the British like to say, they had to fix the data. Well, they had to go back and fix the data again and come back with the truth.

But really who can blame this White House for not leaking? Karl Rove knows that if the American people knew the facts they would not support the policies of this administration. No, this White House is silent about everything it should leak and loose lipped about matters better kept secret. They actually have a bad case of having it all backwards.

So next time when you see the truth, my recommendation, try leaking it.